

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

DREW J. RIBAR,

Plaintiff,

vs.

WASHOE COUNTY, NV, et al,

Defendants.

Case Number 3:24-cv-00526-ART-CSD

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

Dated: May 23, 2025

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE CRAIG S. DENNEY, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

COURTROOM ADMINISTRATOR: Ashlyn Bye REPORTER: Liberty Court Recorder

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF: Drew Ribar

COUNSEL FOR THE COUNTY DEFENDANTS: Lindsay Liddell

COUNSEL FOR BUILD OUR CENTER: Alison Gansert Kertis

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS: MOTION HEARING

9:57 a.m. Court convenes.

The Court holds today's hearing on the Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order (ECF No. 84), the Plaintiff's Motion to Withdraw and Amend Admissions (ECF No. 87), and the County Defendants' Motion for Protective Order (ECF No. 90). In addition to the motions, the Court has reviewed the parties' briefs (ECF Nos. 93, 94, and 95).

The Court addresses Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order (ECF No. 84). The Court inquires if the motion is regarding Request for Production No. 28 only. Mr. Ribar confirms. Ms. Liddell advises that the defendants have withdrawn that request for production.

The Court addresses the Plaintiff's Motion to Withdraw and Amend Admissions (ECF No. 87). Upon inquiry from the Court, Mr. Ribar confirms that the three Requests for Admissions ("RFA") at issue are numbers 7, 27, and 59. Ms. Liddell has no objection to RFA No. 7, but believes the defendants would be prejudiced by allowing amended responses to RFA Nos. 27 and 59. The Court will allow Mr. Ribar to withdraw or amend his responses as to RFA Nos. 7, 27, and 59. The Court reminds Mr. Ribar to adhere to deadlines.

The Court addresses the County Defendants' Motion for Protective Order (ECF No. 90).

DREW J. RIBAR v. WASHOE COUNTY, NV et al
Case Number 3:24-cv-00526-ART-CSD

1 Ms. Liddell presents arguments. Ms. Liddell advises the Court of Mr. Ribar's intention to create
2 the video depositions for the purpose of post-litigation publication and not for litigating the merits
3 of this case. Upon inquiry of the Court, Ms. Liddell advises that the depositions would proceed
4 with a court reporter. Mr. Ribar presents arguments. Mr. Ribar informs the Court that he intends
5 to share the video depositions after this case concludes to show what is happening in our
6 government and make a change in society. The Court has considered the briefs and today's
7 arguments. The Court recites findings on the record. The Court finds that there is a clear and
8 specific threat and promise that the discovery materials will be used in a manner that constitutes
9 good cause for a protective order. The Court will not allow the depositions of the defendants to
be video recorded and finds good cause for a protective order.

10 The Court reminds the parties to adhere to the Civil Standing Order (ECF No. 28) and
follow the local rules.

11 **IT IS ORDERED** that the Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order (ECF No. 84) is denied
12 as moot.

13 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Plaintiff's Motion to Withdraw and Amend
14 Admissions (ECF No. 87) is granted. Mr. Ribar shall respond to Request for Admissions Nos. 7,
15 27, and 59 no later than Monday, June 2, 2025.

16 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the County Defendants' Motion for Protective Order
17 (ECF No. 90) is granted.

18 There being no additional matters to address at this time, court adjourns at 10:38 a.m.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 DEBRA K. KEMPI, CLERK

20 By: /s/
Ashlyn Bye, Deputy Clerk